HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10007291-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Gopikrishna T. Kumar et al.

Confirmation No.: 4719

Application No.: 09/862,360

Examiner: Jeffery L. Williams

Filing Date: May 9, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2137

Title: Session Management for Wireless E-Commerce

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Reply Brief with respect to the Examiner's Answer mailed on May 30, 2008 .

This Reply Brief is being filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.193(b) within two months of the date of the Examiner's Answer.

(Note: Extensions of time are not allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a))

(Note: Failure to file a Reply Brief will result in dismissal of the Appeal as to the claims made subject to an expressly stated new ground rejection.)

No fee is required for filing of this Reply Brief.

If any fees are required please charge Deposit Account 08-2025.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300.
Date of facsimile: July 29, 2008

Typed Name: Judy H. Chung

Signature:

Total number of pages: 10

Respectfully submitted,
Gopikrishna T. Kumar et al.

By

Ashok K. Mannava
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg No. : 45,301
Date : July 29, 2008
Telephone : (703) 652-3822

Rev 10/07 (ReplyBrf)

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Attorney Docket No.: 10007291-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s)	Gopikrishna T. Kumar et al.	**Confirmation No.**	4719
Serial No.:	09/852,360	**Examiner:**	Jeffery L. Williams
Filed:	May 9, 2001	**Group Art Unit:**	2137

Title: Session Management for Wireless E-Commerce

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF - PATENTS

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed May 30, 2008. It is respectfully submitted that the Reply Brief is timely filed within two months of the mail date of the Examiner's Answer.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 10007291-1
App. Ser. No.: 09/852,360

The remarks below are mostly in response to the Examiner's arguments on pages 15-20 of the Examiner's Answer.

1. Remarks pertaining to Examiner's arguments concerning the rejection of claims 1-3, 4 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aziz

On pages 15-16 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner is asserting that Kocher (page 19, paragraphs 1 and 2) teaches the following features of claim 1:

> in response to each subsequent communication from each mobile device to the application program via the connection between the mobile device and the application program while the connection is established, transmitting from the gateway module to the application program the second session identifier that is associated with the first session identifier of the mobile device of the subsequent communication.

As indicated above, claim 1 recites that "while the connection is established" [emphasis added], in response to each subsequent communication transmitting the second session identifier (wherein the second identifier is originally from the application program as recited in the claim) back to the application program from the gateway module.

Kocher discloses in the second paragraph of page 19 that the when the client and server decide to resume a previous session, the client sends a ClientHello to the server using the session ID of the session to be resumed. The server checks its session cache for a match of the session identifier. If the server finds a match and the server is willing to "re-establish the connection", it

will send a ServerHello with the same session ID. The Examiner is interpreting the ClientHello message and session ID sent from the client to the server to resume a previous session as the claimed gateway module sending a second session ID back to the application program.

As specifically stated in Kocher, the ClientHello message of Kocher is for "re-establishing" the connection. Thus, the ClientHello message is not transmitted while the connection is established, and Kocher fails to teach while the connection is established, transmitting the second session identifier for each subsequent communication.

Furthermore, the ClientHello message of Kocher is only transmitted for re-establishing a connection and not for subsequent communications on the re-established connection. That is, Kocher fails to teach that after the connection is re-established, the ClientHello message and the session ID are transmitted from the client to the server for each subsequent communication on the connection. Thus, Kocher fails to teach transmitting the second session identifier for each subsequent communication.

Independent claims 4 and 11 recite features similar to the features of claim 1 described above, which are not taught by Kocher for the reasons stated above.

2. Remarks pertaining to the Examiner's arguments concerning the rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz in view of Davis in further view of Sparks

Claim 6 includes features of receiving checkout requests from the wireless communication devices at the gateway module and transferring the checkout requests to a wallet

module that manages user authentication. Claim 6 also recites a user logged into a wallet module, transmitting payment options from the wallet module to the wireless devices, and transmitting a log-in prompt from the wallet module to the wireless devices. Claim 8 includes the following features: in response to a payment request from a wireless communications device, transmitting the payment request from the gateway module to the merchant application, disassociating the wireless session identifier from the corresponding merchant session identifier, and generating a new wireless session identifier for the wireless communications device when another initial request is received from the wireless communications device. Aziz and Sparks fail to teach or suggest these features.

The Examiner on page 17 of the Examiner's Answer asserts that the prior art combination enables the steps for the wallet module in claim 6. It appears the Examiner is alleging that because Sparks may perform the claimed steps (i.e., enables the claimed wallet module), these features are taught by Sparks. However, merely because the prior art can allegedly perform the claimed steps pertaining to the wallet module, does not mean these features are taught or suggested by the prior art. The Examiner must provide prior art that teaches each of the claimed features. In this case, both Aziz and Sparks fail to teach or suggest the steps of claim 6 pertaining to the wallet module.

Regarding disassociating the wireless session identifier from the corresponding merchant session identifier recited in claim 8, the Examiner asserts on page 18 of the Examiner's Answer that no means of disassociation is claimed, and the session identifiers of the client and server in

Aziz/Kocher are not re-associated unless a session has resumed. The Examiner then states, "for all intents and purposes, they are disassociated."

The Examiner appears to be asserting that when a connection between the client and server is disconnected, the session IDs of the client and server are disassociated. This is not true. Kocher simply maintains a cache of the session IDs for each session. However, Kocher fails to teach any disassociation of client and server session IDs. Instead, Kocher only discloses that to resume a session, a session ID from the client is matched with a session ID in the session cache. However, Kocher does not disclose any disassociation of client and server session IDs. There is no need for disassociation of the client and server session IDs in Kocher because the client and server session IDs, because the IDs are the same for the same session. Thus, there is only a matching process to resume a connection but no disassociation step performed in Kocher to cancel a connection.

3. Remarks pertaining to Examiner's arguments concerning the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of Davis

On page 18 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserts that generating the second session identifiers from the application is not claimed. Instead, claim 1 recites, "second session identifiers from the application program" rather than generating the second session identifiers from the application, and thus the TID field 2005 identifying a terminal is the second session identifiers from the application.

Firstly, the TID field 2005 is a terminal ID. See column 62, lines 61-63. The TID field identifies a physical terminal. The TID 2005, however, does not identify any type of session or connection. Thus, Nguyen in view of Davis fails to teach or suggest the claimed first and second session identifiers.

Also, Nguyen discloses that when the virtual point of sale terminal (VPOS) is used for a transaction, the VPOS uses the VPOS transaction request shown in figure 20D. See column 65, lines 49-58. The VPOS generates a VPOS transaction request including data necessary to process a transaction, such as a TID required by an authorizing bank (see column 62, lines 61-63). In particular, instead of the physical TID 2005, the VPOS generates a virtual terminal ID 2012 for inclusion in the transaction request. See column 65, lines 51-52. A database 2008 at the VPOS is used to determine the virtual terminal ID. See column 65, lines 43-46 and column 66, lines 32-53. Thus, from the disclosure in columns 65 and 66 of Nguyen, when a transaction is to be completed for a customer, the VPOS generates a transaction request including the data structure 2010 (having the virtual terminal ID). The bank 2004 uses the virtual terminal ID in the transaction request to authorize the transaction. Nguyen does not disclose the bank 2004 sends the physical TID 2005 or the virtual terminal ID to the VPOS. Thus, Nguyen in view of Davis fails to teach or suggest second session identifiers from the application program.

Claim 1 recites, "associating the first session identifiers with corresponding second session identifiers from the application program at the gateway module." The Examiner indicates the claimed second session identifiers from the application is TID 2005, which is shown in figure 20B of Nguyen, and the claimed first session identifier is the XACT REQ 2010

shown in figure 20C of Nguyen which allegedly uniquely represents a transaction request from one of the clients 200. Also, the Examiner indicates the claimed application is the ACA Bank 2004 shown in figure 20C, and the claimed gateway module is the VPOS 2007 shown in figure 20C.

Nguyen does not disclose the TID 2005 is used with a VPOS transaction request 2010. Instead, the TID 2005 is used for a physical terminal (see column 65, lines 28-37) rather than for a virtual transaction performed using the VPOS and the virtual terminal ID (see column 65, lines 39-47). Thus, Nguyen does not disclose the physical TID 2005 is associated with the VPOS transaction request as alleged by the Examiner.

Furthermore, the Examiner relies on column 64, lines 36-38 of Nguyen to teach associating the second session identifiers from the application program with the first session identifiers. This passage describes the VPOS engine assigning a virtual terminal ID from the VPOS database 2008. See column 65, lines 43-46 and column 66, lines 32-53. This passage, however, fails to teach or suggest the VPOS receiving a virtual terminal ID from the bank 2004, and also fails to teach or suggest the VPOS associating a terminal ID received from the bank with a transaction request 2010. Thus, Nguyen in view of Davis fails to teach associating the first session identifiers with corresponding second session identifiers from the application program at the gateway module.

Claim 1 also recites, "wherein respective connections are established between the mobile communications devices and the application program." On page 19 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner appears to allege that the claimed connections are disclosed in Nguyen, because a

customer transaction is performed between a customer and a bank. However, as described in the Appeal Brief, the clients 2000 communicate with the VPOS terminal to perform a transaction, such as a payment. The VPOS communicates with the bank 2004 on a separate connection 2003 shown in figure 20C. Thus, Nguyen in view of Davis fails to teach or suggest the claimed connections.

- Davis was combined with Nguyen to teach a mobile device. Davis fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Nguyen. Thus, Nguyen in view of Davis fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1.

PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 10007291-1
App. Ser. No.: 09/852,360

Conclusion

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claims 1-13 described above should be reversed and these claims allowed.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this Reply Brief to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29, 2008 By

Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No.: 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 652-3822
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)